

### **Remarks**

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of July 6, 2009.

At the time of the Office Action claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-21 were pending. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Nachman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027474) in view of Streble et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205119). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Also, the specification of the application was objected to.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments to claim 20 eliminate the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. rejection of claim 20 and the objection to the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the term “software component” can be found at least in paragraph 0044 of the published application corresponding to the present application as filed. Also, Applicants submit that the term “software product” and “memory” are no longer recited in the claims. Hence, Applicant respectfully request that this objection and rejection be withdrawn.

Concerning the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of 1-3, 5-9 and 11-21 based on Nachman in view of Streble, Applicants representative would again like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy and consideration extended during the May 5, 2009 telephone interview. During the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that it may be possible to overcome the rejection by amending the independent claims to include the limitations of dependent claims 4, 5 and 10. The independent claims were previously amended to include the limitations of claims 4 and 10. Now, the independent claims are being amended to include the limitation “the transmission of the message transmitted in step /c/ enabling a validation of the response of the user at the second unit by making sure that said message has actually been transmitted without the limitation imposed to the applications of the first family.” Although this is not the exact language of claim 5, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features of the validation operation that is now recited in the independent claims.

Also, as discussed in the Remarks of the previously filed Amendment, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious combine the teachings of Streble, which relate to effective analysis of web servers, with the teachings of Nachman, which relate to instant messaging between viewers of the same web page. In addition, Applicants submit that neither Streble nor Nachman relates to providing a secured transmission of information from a user in the manner according to the claimed embodiments of the present invention.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

---

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665  
Joseph J. Buczynski, Reg. No. 35,084  
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698  
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)  
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)  
Customer No.: 08968

Date: October 5, 2009  
CH01/ 25386593.1